Pseudotranslation as Passage into History: Murat Gülsoy's *Gölgeler ve Hayaller Şehrinde* as Transmesis

Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar
Boğaziçi University

"Tarih insanı kendine çeken muazzam bir kuyu."
[History is a colossal well that sucks one in.]
(Gülsoy 11)

The use of pseudotranslation as a textual strategy in the Ottoman and Turkish literary fields has been explored from various perspectives by Turkish translation scholars, often as part of an investigation of the ideological and political entanglements of translation and of cultural conceptions of translation (Işın Bengi; Tahir Gürçağlar, "Scouting the Borders"; Işıklar Koçak; Demircioğlu; Öztürk Kasar; Alt). The majority of these studies have focused on indigenous works credited to foreign writers. In contrast, my analysis of Murat Gülsoy's *Gölgeler ve Hayaller Şehrinde* (*In the City of Shadows and Dreams*, abbreviated here as *GHŞ*) focuses on a specific use of pseudotranslation in Turkish literature that has not yet been explored in any detail: the use of pseudotranslation as a frame story. Based on a textual and peritextual analysis of the novel, as well as printed and personal interviews with Gülsoy, I will discuss the writer's motives in writing a book that *reads* like a translation and in foregrounding translation as a self-reflexive tool. This exploration touches upon a rarely studied aspect of pseudotranslation and provides an analysis of an apparent paradox: the use of pseudotranslation, essentially in the form of a literary forgery, to circumvent expectations of realist historical fiction and create a more self-aware reading experience.

Crucially, the novel's use of pseudotranslational strategies cannot be analyzed in isolation from the other ways in which it engages with and/or foregrounds translation. To begin with, the novel contains genuine translations either done by the writer himself, or in the form of references to previously published translations. In addition, the writer creates a rich heteroglossia in the text that partly owes its existence

Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée
CRCL DECEMBER 2017 DÉCEMBRE RCLC
0319–051x/17/44.4/637

to the use of Ottoman Turkish, French, Latin, and Italian phrases, which all serve to reinforce the impression of translation. The novel's use of translator/interpreter characters creates another translational layer and further invites discussion of the literary and pseudohistorical representations of translators. All these figurations of translation, I argue, fall under Thomas O. Beebee's concept of transmesis. Beebee defines transmesis as "literary authors' use of fiction to depict acts of translation" (2-3) and as "the mimesis of the interrelated phenomena of translation, multilingualism, and code-switching" (6). This notion of transmesis includes the following:

> Texts whose mimetic object is the act of translation, the translator, and his or her social and historical contexts.
> Texts that overtly claim to be translations, though no "original" exists. (This is the classic definition of "pseudotranslation," discussed below.)
> Texts that mime a language reality such that the medium does not match the object depicted (e.g., when conversations taking place in Cuba between Cubans are given in English).
> Texts that make standard language strange to itself (Emily Apter, "Translation without Original" 211), inasmuch as such departures are seen as the result of transcoding from another, more "original" language; code-switching; interference from another language; and so forth. (6)

All of the phenomena that Beebee tries to capture under the concept of transmesis appear prominently in *GHŞ*; therefore, it is productive to approach the novel as a form of transmesis, as this will allow me to consider all translational aspects of the novel and not focus solely on its use of pseudotranslation as frame narrative. Furthermore, I will argue that the transmesis that helps shape the textual and thematic aspects of *GHŞ* also expands the concept of pseudotranslation by inviting a consideration of pseudotranslation as a plurivocal and heteroglossic form of writing in which innovative literary forces come together to create self-reflexive narratives.

Pseudotranslation as Frame Narrative

There has been a growing interest, over the last two decades, in the literary manifestations and functions of pseudotranslation. First analyzed in some detail by Anton Popovič, who named the phenomenon "fictitious translation," pseudotranslation has featured prominently in descriptive translation studies thanks to Gideon Toury's focus on the subject, starting with his *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. As the body of work on pseudotranslation grew, the complexities of the concept and the wealth of material it could help unearth became evident. It was, therefore, no coincidence that the American Comparative Literature Association selected pseudotranslation as one of the ideas of the decade in its 2014 report (Rath). While the initial view of pseudotranslation was a way of manipulating audience expectations and expanding readership (Popovič 20), its sociocultural roles have become more

pronounced in studies carried out since then. Recent work on pseudotranslation has demonstrated the theoretical and interdisciplinary potentials of the concept. Case studies from various cultures revealed new aspects and associations of pseudotranslation that reach beyond the well-known motivations of authors who present original texts as translations, such as the introduction of innovations to a target culture, expression of dissident ideas or models without being subject to censorship or sanctions (which Toury discusses as acts of culture planning), pursuit of commercial gain, or as a narrative tool (Toury, "Enhancing Cultural Changes" 4; *Beyond* 41-44). Pseudotranslating is at the same time a sophisticated authorial choice, and the study of pseudotranslation may do more than serve as an explanatory and descriptive tool regarding translatorial behaviour, as Toury suggests ("Enhancing Cultural Changes" 5). Studies on pseudotranslation touch upon the behaviour not only of translators within a given culture, but also of the readers; perceptions or discourses on pseudotranslation can be used as indicators of the general public's views on authorship and originality (Tahir Gürçağlar, "Scouting the Borders"). Pseudotranslation may introduce interesting perspectives on the ontology of translation by questioning the conventional view on translation "as a replacement for the original" or "essentialist notions of what the original 'is'" (Apter 222). Pseudotranslation may also help create alternative voices or personas for poets and writers (O'Sullivan 123; Tahir Gürçağlar, "Scouting the Borders").

Most studies of pseudotranslation within translation studies have focused on works that are paratextually presented as translations. These are mostly cases of works that are overtly attributed to an existing or imaginary source author, deeming the purported source author a pseudonym for the original author (Santoyo, "Seudotraducciónes" 364), and/or works whose original author is presented or implied as some form of a translator. Although these types of works are at times referred to as a "literary hoax" (Lefevere 1123), they draw attention to the specific relationship between the author and the reader, in which the reader is kept uninformed about the true provenance of the work. However, there are also cases in which pseudotranslation becomes a literary device and a frame story, rather than a text *actually* attributed to a source author. In these cases, the intention is not to disguise the author of the text, but to invite the reader to enter into a different contract with the author and the text. In her article on alternative types and notions of translation, Susan Bassnett touches upon the difficulty of defining translation and notes that, rather than thinking of translation as a category in its own right, we need to consider it "as a set of textual practices with which the writer and reader collude" (39). The "collusion" Bassnett mentions is especially pertinent when the use of translation as a frame story triggers a certain engagement with a literary text, similar to Coleridge's idea of "willing suspension of disbelief" (Childs and Fowler 18).[1]

Julio César Santoyo, who pioneered the study of pseudotranslation as a narrative technique, discusses two distinct types of pseudotranslations: implicit or opaque ("implicita u opaca") and explicit or transparent ("explicita o transparente")

("Seudotraducciónes" 358). In the former case, the name of a translator is not offered, and it is the peritextual information that leads to the assumption that the text is a translation. For this, Santoyo offers examples from popular literature in mid-twentieth-century Spain whose authors wrote western or detective stories under foreign pseudonyms ("Seudotraducciónes" 358). Explicit pseudotranslations contain overt paratextual information designating a work as translation ("Seudotraducciónes" 358). According to Santoyo, a translational frame narrative would be considered an explicit pseudotranslation, since it intentionally positions a work as translation. Santoyo has identified a common pattern behind the use of pseudotranslation as a frame story: the author "recovers" an old manuscript or document in a foreign language, almost always by chance, and offers it to the reading public by "translating" it faithfully ("La traducción"40). The insertion of a translational frame narrative creates a metafictional story within a story, and the frame story, summarizing the circumstances under which the "original" text was found and "translated," becomes both a "pretext" and a "pre-text" for the main story that proceeds independently ("La traducción" 44; "Seudotraducciónes" 359). Santoyo mentions various motives for using pseudotranslation as a narrative technique, the first of which is the author's desire to create a "literary game" ("Seudotraducciónes" 361) in which the readers readily become complicit, even though they are aware of the text's status as a non-translation. A motive particularly used until the sixteenth century was to resort to pseudotranslation as a method of creating historical credibility by indicating Latin or Greek as source languages ("Seudotraducciónes" 361). In the eighteenth century, it was not uncommon to publish letters "written" by foreign individuals reporting about foreign customs and situations through an innocent eye ("Seudotraducciónes" 365), and these letters would be allegedly translated. These cases constitute the background against which *GHŞ* needs to be read. Although Gülsoy's utilization of pseudotranslation as a frame narrative appears to play a similar role in increasing historical credibility, the multiple levels of discourse Gülsoy creates, both in the main text and in the footnotes, end up subverting expectations of credibility and raise questions about historical authenticity.

GHŞ starts with a four-page untitled preface, dated 1998 and signed with the initials M.F.A. This is the assumed translator of the remaining 287 pages of the novel, who otherwise remains anonymous throughout the work. The preface establishes the frame narrative by offering an account of how the book was discovered by the translator in a second-hand book store in 1968. In fact, it was not a book, but an old notebook M.F.A. acquired. The notebook consisted of a series of letters written in French which were presumably copied in the notebook by their writer before they were mailed to their addressee. M.F.A. explains his decision to translate the letters into Turkish as follows:

> Marsilya'dan kalkan bir gemiyle İstanbul'a gelen Fuat adlı bir gencin Paris'teki arkadaşına yazdığı mektuplar 21 Ağustos 1908 tarihinde başlıyor, 1909'un belirsiz bir tarihine—muhtemelen haziran ayına—kadar devam ediyor ve fevkalade bir dönemi tasvir etmenin

> yanında şimdi burada kim olduklarını açıklayarak heyecanını kaçırmak istemediğim istisnai kişilere de tesadüf ediyordu. Bu sebeble defterde yazanları tercüme etmeye karar verdim. Ancak meslekten bir tercüman olmadığım için epeyce zorlandığımı itiraf etmeliyim. (Gülsoy 10)[2]

This information offered in the second page of the preface starts the collusion between Gülsoy and his readers, and positions the work as a translation. This is the first step in the construction of the transmesis, and this step serves the dual purpose of establishing the status of the work as a translation *and* its historical value, relaying experiences involving an "extraordinary" time with "exceptional" people. In order to enjoy and engage in the rest of the novel, the reader must believe and question both of these things at the same time: that the book is not a work of fiction, but a documentary source about real historical events, and that it is in fact translated. Starting with the preface, Gülsoy's juxtaposition of translation and history enables both the fictionalization of an important moment in Turkish history, and the grounding of the fictional story of a young man's journey to Istanbul and his personal past in historical facts. This juxtaposition also disrupts the seemingly realist style of the novel and lies at the heart of Gülsoy's challenge of the "authentic fallacy" (De Groot 183). This challenge is meant to prevent the readers from simply "believing" that what they are reading is real or authentic. At the level of the frame narrative, then, the explicit use of pseudotranslation creates a fragmentation in the experience of reading. Finding out that the book is a translation, and knowing that it is in fact *not*, dismisses any claim to historical authenticity (undermining the authentic fallacy), while at the same time, the revealed translation status of *GHŞ* opens an alternative and more self-aware passage into history for the reader who is willingly co-opted in the literary ploy that Gülsoy has created.

In his book on the historical novel, Jerome de Groot points out that both the reading and writing of the historical novel are embedded within a form of anxiety. He argues that each writer of historical fiction tries to demonstrate their approach of bringing fiction and history together to the reader, which "highlights the artificiality of the novel, introduces a fundamental metafictional element to the form, and demonstrates that as a genre the historical novel provokes a certain anxiety and disquiet on the part of the writer" (De Groot 9). For Maria Margaronis, this anxiety is triggered by the ethical questions that most writers of historical fiction must face, involving responsibility to the historical record, appropriating the real sufferings of historical subjects for literary purposes, and the limits of the licence to invent, among others (Margaronis 138). Gülsoy's own statements about his novel indicate that this anxiety is triggered by questions of linguistic challenges and the need to observe historical authenticity while offering a critical recontextualization of history for the contemporary reader. Thus, while writers of historical fiction are aware of the tensions brought on by the need to master both facts and fiction in their writing, the need to articulate this tension to the readers leads them to formulate creative methods to do so. For Gülsoy, the creative urge seems to have resulted in the invention of

the pseudotranslation frame as a convenient thematic, stylistic, and linguistic tool for handling the tension.

Published in 2014 and awarded the prestigious Sedat Simavi Prize for Literature in the same year, *Gölgeler ve Hayaller Şehrinde* is Murat Gülsoy's eighteenth book.[3] The novel mainly focuses on the gradual shift in a young man's state of mind as he goes through a significant identity crisis when faced with his past. It is also a novel about Turkey's cultural liminality between the East and the West, with which most modern fictional writing in Turkish is preoccupied. The novel covers a critical year in Turkey's history, from the summer of 1908 to the summer of 1909, when the Ottoman Empire experienced great social and political turmoil while constitutional monarchy was reinstated in the country. The protagonist of the novel is a fictional French journalist by the name of Fuat Franck Chausson, who was presumably born to a French woman and a famous Turkish intellectual, Beşir Fuat. Beşir Fuat (1852-87), one of the authentic characters in the novel, was a well-known critic and translator of the late Ottoman era who committed suicide as part of an experiment he conducted on himself. Gülsoy refers to his personal interest in Beşir Fuat as the main inspiration behind the novel (Şahinler 17). Beşir Fuat indeed had a French lover and they had a daughter together, but never had a son. Therefore, the novel is the story of their hypothetical son (Oral 22-23). The back cover of the novel summarizes the plot as follows:

> Meşrutiyetin ilanından sonra bir Fransız gazetesi Türkiye'de olup bitenleri ilk kaynaktan öğrenmek için İstanbul'a muhabir göndermeye karar verir. Türk asıllı bir Fransız gazeteci bu işe talip olur ve köklerinin bulunduğu şehre, İstanbul'a doğru yola çıkar. *Gölgeler ve Hayaller Şehrinde*, Osmanlı'nın bu çalkantılı dönemindeki toplumsal hisrterinin romanı. Yabancı kaldığı ülkesinde olan biteni yabancılara rapor eden bir Türk'ün, bir yandan Osmanlı toplumunun akıl tutulmasını gözlemlerken bir yandan da kendi geçmişiyle yüzleşmesinin hikayesi. (Gülsoy, back cover)[4]

Upon his arrival in the city, Fuat is befriended by Charles, a wealthy Englishman, who proposes that they write a book about the city, which Fuat accepts. The novel depicts Istanbul from Fuat's eyes and relays the inner journey he takes to come to grips with his past as the illegitimate son of an Ottoman intellectual. The novel is composed of letters he writes to his friend Alex, who suffers from tuberculosis and eventually dies. Fuat discovers the identity of his father and learns about Beşir Fuat's suicide and his true feelings for his mother, which bring Fuat to the brink of madness. He does not go back to France, and finds refuge at his old nanny's house, in the company of a childhood friend, as Istanbul experiences one of its bloodiest springs.

The Use of Peritextual Devices in Presenting *GHŞ* as a Pseudotranslation

In his seminal work, Gerard Genette discusses two different types of paratexts, based on their location in relation to the text: peritexts, which are located immediately

around the text they help present; and epitexts, which are located at a distance from the text, such as reviews and interviews (4-5). For Genette, "it goes without saying, peritext and epitext completely and entirely share the spatial field of the paratext" (5). An analysis of the paratextual presentation of *GHŞ* to its readers reveals that Gülsoy builds a pseudoparadoxical relationship between some of the peritext and the epitext of *GHŞ*. He constructs the peritext mainly to enhance the authentic fallacy, while the epitexts (in this article, these will be explored in the form of interviews carried out with Gülsoy) immediately reveal the status of the novel as a pseudotranslation, and carefully contextualize the use of translation.

As the most immediately accessible peritextual element of the novel, the cover introduces Murat Gülsoy as the writer of *GHŞ*. On the front cover, his name is printed in the same size as the title, and is made even more prominent by the use of the colour maroon, as opposed to the brown colour in which the title appears. As Genette indicates, the author's name fulfills "a contractual function" (41), and in this case, this function is one of creating an expectation in the readers. Gülsoy's name on the cover, as well as the publisher's logo, "Can Roman" ("roman" means *a novel* in Turkish, and Can is the name of a major publisher in the Turkish market), signal to the readers that what they are about to read is a novel by a well-known author. This knowledge is confirmed in the title pages, in the page that lists Gülsoy's works published by Can and in a short biography of Gülsoy which follows this page. The biography, printed on page 7, marks the transition from the factual into the fictional universe, and page 9 begins the novel with a preface by the "translator." This is the threshold beyond which readers are invited to believe that what they will be reading is a translation and a non-fictional documentary work. This game continues throughout the novel.

Gülsoy uses three peritextual devices to create and reinforce the impression of translation. The first one is the untitled preface attributed to M.F.A., who reveals himself as both the discoverer and the translator of the fictional letters. The key function of the preface in establishing the novel as a historically authentic translation has already been discussed above. Genette uses the term *preface* to "designate every type of introductory (preludial or postludial) text, authorial or allographic, consisting of a discourse produced on the subject of the text that follows or precedes it" (161). According to Genette, there are various types of senders of prefaces, depending on their claim to "truth" (178). The preface "written" by M.F.A. would fall under the category of auctorial prefaces written by *fictive* senders, that is, if we assume that the readers are aware that the book is indeed a work of fiction and is originally written (not translated) by Murat Gülsoy.[5] Although such prefaces are distinguished by their "playful regime" (Genette 278), once inside the universe of *GHŞ* marked by transmesis, the preface turns "serious" (Genette 278) and needs to be read as though it were penned by an *authentic* sender, the translator.[6] Apart from informing the readers that the book is a presumed translation, M.F.A. also explains that a burglar stole the source letters from his office in 1979, leaving their translation behind (Gülsoy 11). The preface also evokes the questions of whether M.F.A. can be trusted as a translator, or

whether the letters never existed at all and are mere fruits of his imagination. This more implicit question is never formulated clearly or answered in the novel. Gülsoy, however, has explained that this was a deliberate choice on his part in order to create an unreliable narrator in the person of the translator (Tahir Gürçağlar, "Interview").

The second peritext that follows the preface is an epigraph that creates a border between the narrative frame and the main text, as it is the epigraph chosen by Fuat, the sender of the letters that constitute the novel. This is a Turkish translation of the sixth and seventh stanzas of Rimbaud's *Le Bateau ivre*. The epigraph seems to serve several functions, the most visible of which is thematic. The poem sets the tone for the novel in a romantic and melancholic mood and anchors it in the nineteenth-century French poetic tradition, the tradition where Fuat tried to belong as a failed poet. This is further reinforced by references to the poem in the letters themselves. Indeed, in an email correspondence on 4 August 2016, Gülsoy has confirmed the important role played by the epigraph as "a key to the reading process" whereby the readers would be constantly reminded that what they were reading was a translation. However, the functions of the epigraph do not end there. The translation reads like a very literal one and is supplemented by a footnote offering the original stanzas, presumably given by the translator. There is an additional note by the publisher: "Yukarıda M.F.A.nın yaptığı çeviriye müdahale etmedik çünkü mektuplar kısmında bu şiire göndermeler var; ancak Sabahattin Eyüboğlu tarafından yapılmış çevirisini de aşağıda sunuyoruz" (Gülsoy 13).[7] On the surface, M.F.A.'s translation seems to confirm his confession in the preface, and strengthens his image as a non-professional translator. This impression is especially created by the publisher's note, which introduces a translation by a well-known translator, famous for his domesticating and fluent translations, and seems to imply that M.F.A.'s translation is somewhat inferior. The two translations stand in contrast to each other. Thus, where M.F.A.'s translation reads like an alienating and foreign text, Eyüboğlu's translation flows like a poem originally written in Turkish. Most Turkish readers would find M.F.A.'s translation crude and would favour Eyüboğlu's translation. However, the foreignizing tendencies in M.F.A.'s translation give away a certain poetic sensibility on the part of Gülsoy, who translated the poem himself from French. Interestingly enough, he argues that he does not read French well enough to translate from it professionally (Tahir Gürçağlar, "Interview"). The epigraph further blurs the border between fact and fiction that the author has already playfully distorted by structuring the novel in the form of the translation of a non-fictional text. The footnote added to the epigraph welcomes the readers to a reading process both guided and disrupted by the frequent use of footnotes in the novel.

The third type of peritext Gülsoy uses are the footnotes, which introduce two additional voices to the narrative text. The letters are written by the main narrator, Fuat, and as the novel progresses, his voice becomes increasingly less reliable. Fuat's discourse is constructed by realistic depictions of places and events that are gradually tainted by dream imagery and the knowledge of his poor mental state. The footnotes

introduce the voices of the translator and the publisher. Where the translator's footnotes have a dialogical relationship with the notebook that serves as the source text, the publisher's notes are more complex, introducing comments on both the source text and the translator's notes and translation. A total of 44 notes are attributed to the translator, 21 to the publisher, and three to both. According to Genette's classification (332), these footnotes are auctorial fictional, and belong to the fictive universe. Through the footnotes, the publisher becomes one of the characters in the novel, albeit an invisible yet audible one. The footnotes reveal a critical attitude towards the translation and establish the publisher as somewhat more authoritative than the translator. The publisher appears skeptical of M.F.A.'s translation choices and provides comments and suggestions, beginning with the footnote on Rimbaud quoted above and continuing throughout the novel. In another instance, the publisher offers two alternatives by well-known translators for M.F.A.'s translation of Mallarme (Gülsoy 49), and in five other cases, he directly or indirectly criticizes M.F.A.'s translation decisions (Gülsoy 25, 60, 63, 110, 248). The publisher's other footnotes introduce information about the historical background of some terms and events occurring in the letters, such as the Children's Crusade, the occupation of the Ottoman Bank by Armenian revolutionaries in 1896, or the etymology of Istanbul's name. Together with the critical comments on M.F.A.'s translations, these explanatory footnotes not only lend an authoritative voice to the publisher, but also serve to link the fictional universe with the actual world. The publisher mediates between external reality and the narrative plot relayed to the readers. The function of the translator's notes is different: these notes mostly serve as translations of phrases in Latin and Italian left intact in the text, with the exception of a few explanatory notes. They therefore mostly remain within the fictional world of the found letters rather than offering external references. This function is an important component of the work's transmesis and helps convey an explicit multilingualism in the novel, which will be taken up in greater detail in the next section. Towards the end of the novel, the translator's footnotes take on the additional function of describing illustrations in the notebook. As he slips into paranoia and his writing becomes more delusional, Fuat draws pictures in the letters, which the translator describes, along with the changes in the style of the letters. The translator informs the reader, "Buradan itibaren defterdeki notlar düzensizleşiyor. Yırtık sayfalar, karalanmış, okunamayan yazılar, acemice çizilmiş bazı resimler var" (Gülsoy 269).[8] Some footnotes (140, 289) refer to missing pages in the notebook, and one particular footnote (89) accompanies two pages of the translation that are full of gaps and create a visual interruption in the flow of the novel: "Bu sayfalar ıslanıp birbirine yapışmış, ayırmaya çalıştım ama yazıların çoğu okunmuyordu. Okuyabildiğim tek tük kelimeler tercüme ettim" (Gülsoy 89).[9] These comments reinforce the seeming authenticity of Fuat's letters that serve as M.F.A.'s source text, and constantly remind the readers of the text as a translation.

In an interview with me, Gülsoy explained that the translator's and publisher's footnotes had more than one goal. They primarily served to enhance the verisimili-

tude of the novel, and also helped convey historical and background information. Such notes were necessary, since the epistolary form made it difficult to insert cultural explanations in the main text. Gülsoy also acknowledged the alienation created by the footnotes during the reading experience, implying the heteroglossia that they helped create in the novel (Tahir Gürçağlar 2016).

Murat Gülsoy on *GHŞ*

This section explores a specific aspect of the epitextual presentation of *GHŞ* and reflects on how Gülsoy accounts for his motives and choice of the pseudotranslation frame, as he discussed in interviews following the publication of *GHŞ* in 2014. My material will also include information extracted from a personal interview I carried out with the author in May 2016.

In most of the interviews occasioned by the publication of *GHŞ*, Gülsoy was asked about his choice of the epistolary genre and the use of translation as a frame story. His responses indicate that neither of these choices was arbitrary, and that they both developed as indispensable tools in his first historical novel. He was well aware of the capacity of the epistolary novel to increase credibility (Yağmur 15), yet he also chose the epistolary genre because it allowed him to avoid the use of dialogues (Avcı). Why, then, did he specifically design those letters as translations? Claiming that the addition of the translator's preface makes *GHŞ* a documentary novel (Yağmur 15), Gülsoy indicates that he chose the translation framework in order to enhance the authentic fallacy. This is in line with his statement, "Her ne kadar realist bir edebiyatçı gibi görünmesem de gerçeklik kaygısı güdüyorum" (Avcı),[10] and with his observation that that he was true to his historical sources and used historical characters in the book such as Prince Sabahattin, Beşir Fuat, or Publisher Arakel (Şahinler 17).

At the same time, Gülsoy regards language as something that can both enhance and potentially disrupt authenticity in the historical novel, especially in the context of Turkey, where language policies have resulted in a radical transformation of script and vocabulary in a matter of decades. Gülsoy was concerned that he would not be able to reproduce the written and spoken language of Turkey in 1908, and that this would be detrimental to the authenticity he was trying to establish (Atamer). He explains his choice of the pseudotranslation framework as a linguistic imperative:

> Gerçekliğe daha fazla yaklaşabilmek için dil sorununu bir şekilde halletmeliydim. Bu yüzden de kahramanım Fuat'ın başından geçenleri Fransa'da bir sanatoryumda tedavi görmekte olan yakın arkadaşı Alex'e yazdığı mektuplar üzerinden kurguladım. Elbette bu mektuplar Fransızca olarak yazılacaktı. Ancak Fuat eskiden sıklıkla yapıldığı gibi yazdığı mektupların bir kopyasını yanından hiç ayırmadığı defterine yazacaktı. Bu özel deri ciltli defter yıllar sonra, 1968'de bir sahafta bulunacak, tarihe meraklı bir avukat tarafından Türkçe'ye çevrilecekti. Biz roman olarak bu çeviriyi okuyoruz. (Oral 22)[11]

The above quotation indicates that Gülsoy specifically wanted to avoid the use of

"bygonese"—a plausible, yet mostly inaccurate language used in the historical novel to increase verisimilitude (see Mitchell; Stocker). Due to the specificity of the Turkish context, Gülsoy appears to have found resorting to "bygonese" problematic. This is not surprising, given his constructivist approach to language and ideology. As he said in an interview with Semih Gümüş, "Dünyamızı dille kuruyoruz. İdeolojik olan kendini dilde kuruyor. İnsanlar kendilerini, benliklerini dil ile yapılandırıyor ve algılıyor. Dolayısıyla dil edebiyatçı için yaşamsal öneme sahip" (Gümüş 69).[12]

As other interviews only marginally addressed translational issues in *GHŞ*, I deliberately focused on these issues in my own conversation with Gülsoy. Gülsoy openly mentioned the pains he took in creating a "translated" discourse in the letters themselves. Apart from the two French poems mentioned above, Gülsoy (in the guise of M.F.A.) also translated various Latin and Italian phrases in the footnotes, and a number of quotations from nineteenth-century western writers in the main text, such as Nerval (139) and Wells (168). Beyond these explicit acts of translation, however, Gülsoy also intensively engaged in another translation activity during the preparations for the novel. In order to create the language of the protagonist's letters, Gülsoy did a great deal of historical research on the letters, diaries and other works by nineteenth-century French travelers who visited Istanbul, and tried to recreate their language in the letters. These intertextual references, which are not always explicitly acknowledged, permeate the many orientalist descriptions of Istanbul in Fuat's letters. In the interview with Semih Gümüş, Gülsoy presented this intertextuality and the foreign discourse he created as part of the pseudotranslation framework: "Metnin orijinalinda kullanılması gereken düşünüş ve söyleyiş tarzının Fransız-Osmanlı melezi bir zihinden çıkmış olması gerekiyordu. Tabii bu dil karmaşasının içinden çıkabilmek için o dönem yazılmış edebiyat eserlerini de okumam gerekti" (Gümüş 69).[13]

Other Elements of Transmesis in *GHŞ*

My interview with Gülsoy also opened up a discussion about the presence of translation on multiple levels in the story; our conversation has revealed clues regarding the aspects of *GHŞ* that associate the work with transmesis. Apart from the pseudotranslation frame narrative, other significant features of the novel that create its transmesis include the multilingual nature of the letters and the frequent references to the multiplicity of cultures and languages present in the Ottoman capital. As previously mentioned, Latin and Italian phrases are scattered throughout the book, such as "in regione caecordum rex est luscus" (139), "sum quod sum" (146), "collige, virgo, rosas" (193), "ira Deorum," "fai la ninna fai la nanna" (51), or "sono morti" (223), which create a foreignizing effect in the Turkish text. However, in addition to these phrases, there are many other references to the different ethnic groups that lived in the Ottoman Empire at the time, such as Armenians, Bulgarians, Jews, and

Georgians, and their languages in the context of cosmopolitan life in Istanbul. These languages and cultural references emphasize the fragmentation and hybridity in Fuat's world, as well as in Istanbul, which is almost personified in the novel. An interesting linguistic aspect of the novel is Gülsoy's use of the Turkish lexis typical of the 1960s and 1970s to write the book, hence the date of 1968 as the date of its discovery. In our interview, he explained this choice as his affinity towards the mixed vocabulary used at that time. He suggested that the discourse of the time enabled writers to use a vocabulary from the Ottoman past, but not in a stiff or revivalist mode (Tahir Gürçağlar, "Interview"). This slightly "dated," but oddly refreshing, language triggers a self-aware reading process in the readers as they are invited to read a historical novel about the turn of the century (the events take place in 1908-09) written in the Turkish of the 1960s. The effect is a disruption of the authentic fallacy, which is replaced by a playful identification with the narrator.

On the level of its characters as well, *GHŞ* is a novel marked by transmesis. Fuat, the novel's protagonist, is both a translated and translating character. He works as an interpreter for Charles in their efforts to write a book on Istanbul together. In addition to his linguistic translation, he also translates Istanbul to his French and British friends, helping them to make sense of this liminal space between the East and the West. As a journalist, he relays the troublesome social and political context of Istanbul, as well as the violent events of 1908-09, to his readers, which can also be conceived of as an act of cultural translation. In the meantime, his arrival and stay in Istanbul imprison him in a never-ending translation process in which his French and Turkish sides are in constant clash and conflict, and in order to come to grips with who he really "is," Fuat has to negotiate these two identities. Alongside Fuat's personal inner and physical journey, the novel also narrates the political transformation of the Ottoman Empire and the tension between democratic and traditional forces, which can also be traced as a process of translation.

Most of the key characters in the novel are translators. Apart from the two obvious translator characters, M.F.A. and Fuat, two other translators appear: Alex, Fuat's friend in France, and Beşir Fuat, Fuat's father, who adds a biographical and documentary aspect to the novel. Although the epistolary nature of the novel prevents the reader from gaining a full-fledged picture of these characters, there is enough evidence to suggest that they all share a dark fate. None of these characters attains any kind of satisfaction in life, and their lives all end with unfulfilled dreams. M.F.A.'s life as a lawyer and a family man goes by all too fast and comes to a lonely end; the readers only read his translation posthumously. Alex dies in the sanatorium. In reality, Beşir Fuat, who is one of the historical characters in the book, was an industrious translator, as well as an author and an educated man of letters. However, he killed himself at the age of thirty-six, driven by a fear of turning insane like his mother. His death took place years before the novel begins. It is uncertain what happens to the character of Fuat; although Gülsoy does not openly kill him at the end of the novel, Fuat becomes delusional, and the novel's open ending may well be interpreted as a

form of death. In one of his interviews, Gülsoy argues that the actual ending of the novel has little relevance for what happens to Fuat, and that for him, "Fuat, Gölgeler ve Hayaller Şehrinde dolaşmaya devam edecek. O sahnelerin içinde sonsuzca tekrar edecek sorusunu: Ben kimim?" (Oral 23).[14] In summary, all these translator characters are afflicted by unhappiness, or mental or physical disease, and a sense of unfulfillment rules their lives. This suggests that Gülsoy used translation as a metaphor for questions of identity and personal belonging, or the lack thereof. As Kaindl argues (9), the use of translator characters or depictions of processes of translation to express issues of identity, death, or illness, is in fact a common pattern in literature.

Finally, I contend that Murat Gülsoy himself is the chief translator in the novel in his efforts to "translate" historical facts and personalities for contemporary Turkish readers through a multi-faceted translational design. The tension Gülsoy builds between the fictional and historical worlds, and his invitation to the readers to transgress the borders between the two, result from this very design. He "translates" the historical events of 1908-09 that spelled the end of the oppressive rule of Abdulhamid II to the contemporary reader at a critical moment in 2014, in the aftermath of the 2013 Gezi Protests. Although the novel makes no explicit references to the Gezi Protests, its timing and theme suggest a strong parallelism, a feeling that is heightened by the year the letters were found by M.F.A., 1968. Gülsoy articulates this parallelism in his interview with Semih Gümüş:

> Tabii son olarak da Gezi olayları... 1908'i yazıyordum, II. Meşrutiyet'in ilanının nasıl bir devrim olduğunu, müstebit II. Abdülhamid'in kurduğu baskı rejiminin nasıl da çatır çatır yıkıldığını okuyordum ve o sırada Gezi'de insanlar aynı özgürlük saikiyle ayaklanıyorlardı. Tarih ile yaşanan an garip bir şekilde romanda kesişti […] (Gümüş 88)[15]

Conclusion

Although Gülsoy claims that his choice of pseudotranslation was motivated by his search for creating verisimilitude in the novel, I have argued that the transmesis of *GHŞ* works against verisimilitude by creating a fragmented reading experience through translation that shuttles back and forth between fiction and history. Murat Gülsoy is the chief translator, linking the past and the present and recontextualizing the past for a modern readership. His foregrounding of translation throughout the novel, both as a metaphor and as a narrative device, confirms many recent findings about the fictional uses of translation and stands as an excellent testing ground to confirm theories of "transfiction" that have flourished during the past decade (Kaindl and Spitzl). What makes *GHŞ* an original contribution to the field is the way in which it uses pseudotranslation to develop an alternative passage into history. The pseudotranslation frame narrative successfully avoids linguistic challenges triggered by a need to create a credible discourse around historical moments and

subjects. However, this brings on additional challenges that force Gülsoy to carry out extensive research and adopt a heteroglossic style in the text. The initial choice of using a pseudotranslation as frame story seems to have triggered the incorporation of many other translational elements into the novel, starting with the decision to add translator's and publisher's notes, genuine translations, and a "translated" discourse in relaying the thoughts and feelings of the French-Ottoman protagonist, as well as plural translator characters. The transmesis of *GHŞ* owes much to this initial choice.

Notes

1. Klaus Kaindl argues that a distinction should be made between these types of texts, which he dubs "fictitious translations" and pseudotranslations. He maintains that "[i]n contrast to pseudotranslations as defined by Toury (1995), fictitious translation is not about relinquishing responsibility as an author by claiming a text to be a translation, it is about playing with the boundaries of the real and the fictional text-worlds" (7). Kaindl bases his argument on Hans Christian Hagedorn's study on novels that utilize fictional translation as forms of "narrated translation" which he calls "traducción ficticia" without distinguishing them from other types of pseudotranslations in any clear terms (see Hagedorn). In this essay, I use the term *pseudotranslation* to refer to both types of texts and do not resort to the term *fictitious translation*.

2. "The letters addressed to a friend in Paris by a young man named Fuat, who arrived in Istanbul on a ship that departed from Marseille, began on August 21, 1908 and continued until an unknown date in 1909—probably in the month of June—and not only did they depict an extraordinary time period but also told of encounters with exceptional individuals whom I would not like to divulge here in order to preserve some of the suspense. That was the reason why I decided to translate the contents of the notebook. However, I must admit that I found this rather challenging as I was not a professional translator." (All translations into English are mine.)

3. For a short biography and links about Murat Gülsoy, see his English Wikipedia page: en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Murat_Gülsoy (visited on July 16, 2016).

4. "Following the restitution of the constitution, a French newspaper decides to send a correspondent to Istanbul in order to report the events taking place in Turkey directly from their source. A French journalist with Turkish origins volunteers for the job and sets sail for Istanbul, the city where his roots are.
Gölgeler ve Hayaller Şehrinde is a novel of the social hysteria around this tumultuous time in the Ottoman Empire. This is the story of a Turk who informs foreigners about his estranged country and of his observations on the Ottoman society experiencing an eclipse of reason as he comes face to face with his own past."

5. Although this is the most likely situation, given the author's status as a well-known writer, it cannot be taken for granted. In our interview, Murat Gülsoy told me about an experience he had early that day, when he was invited to speak at a secondary school. During his talk with the students, he realized that the students had taken *GHŞ* as a genuine translation. The students were disappointed to hear that the translator was not a real person and wanted confirmation that at least the preface was genuine. Gülsoy appeared highly amused by this experience and the naïveté of the students, which indicated that he had not intended the novel to be read as a genuine translation (Tahir Gürçağlar, "Interview").

6. Genette suggests that prefaces written by translators are allographic (264); in other words, they are written by third parties. In my previous work, I have offered a criticism of Genette's source-oriented view of translation and argued that translators' prefaces are neither authorial or allographic, but that

they need to be explored as a separate category (Tahir Gürçağlar, "Agency").

7. "Above, we did not intervene in the translation done by M.F.A. because there are references to this poem in the letters; however, we also offer the translation done by Sabahattin Eyüboğlu."

8. "The notes in the notebook become disorganized after this point. There are torn pages, crossed-out illegible phrases, and some ineptly rendered drawings."

9. "These pages were soaked and stuck to each other; I tried to separate them but most of the writing was illegible. I translated the odd word that I was able to read."

10. "Although I do not appear to be a realist writer, I pursue a concern for authenticity."

11. "I somehow had to deal with the problem of language in order to get closer to reality. That is why I constructed my protagonist Fuat's experiences by means of letters he wrote to his friend Alex, who was undergoing treatment in a sanatorium in France. Of course these letters would be written in French. Yet Fuat would copy these letters down in the notebook he kept with him all the time, as was often the custom in old times. This special notebook bound in leather would be discovered in a second-hand bookshop years later, in 1968, and a lawyer with a penchant for history would translate them into Turkish. What we are reading as a novel is this translation."

12. "We construct our world through language. That which is ideological constructs itself through language. People structure and perceive themselves and their selves through language. Therefore, language has vital significance for a writer."

13. "The thoughts and expressions that would have been there in the original text had to be the product of a French-Ottoman hybrid mind. Of course, in order to deal with this linguistic complexity I had to read literary works written at that time."

14. "Fuat will continue to roam about in the City of Shadows and Dreams. He will forever repeat his question among those scenes: who am I?"

15. "And finally, the Gezi Protests… I was writing about 1908, I was reading about the revolution that the declaration of the Second Constitution was, about how the despotic regime created by Abdulhamid II had crumbled, and right at that time people were protesting in Gezi with the same demands for freedom. History and the present moment crossed paths in the novel in an eerie way [...]."

Works Cited

Alt, Nil. *A Gender-Based Study of Nihal Yeğinobali's Pseudo-translation* Genç Kızlar. MA thesis, Boğaziçi U, 2008.

Apter, Emily. *The Translation Zone*. Princeton UP, 2006.

Atamer, Zeynep. "Murat Gülsoy'la Söyleşi. Bu kitabı yazdıran Tarihi Bir Figürdü: Beşir Fuat" ["An Interview with Murat Gülsoy: A Historical Figure Had Me Write This Book: Beşir Fuat"]. 2014. 1000kitap.com/roportaj/Murat-Gulsoyla-Soylesi

Avcı, Ümran. "Murat Gülsoy'la konuştuk: Gölgeler, hayaller ve uzun bir intihar provası : Egoist okur" ["Conversation with Murat Gülsoy: Shadows, Dreams, and a Long Suicide Rehearsal: The Egoist Reader"]. 2 Dec. 2014. egoistokur.com/golgeler-hayaller-ve-uzun-bir-intihar-provasi

Bassnett, Susan. "When Is a Translation Not a Translation?" *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*, edited by Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, Multilingual Matters, 1998, pp. 25-40.

Beebee, Thomas. *Transmesis: Inside Translation's Black Box*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Bengi-Öner, Işın. *Çeviri Bir Süreçtir...Ya Çeviribilim?* Sel Yayıncılık, 1999.

Childs, Peter, and Richard Fowler, editors. *The Routledge Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms*. Routledge, 2014.

De Groot, Jerome. *The Historical Novel*. Routledge, 2010.

Demircioğlu, Cemal. *From Discourse to Practice: Rethinking "Translation" (Terceme) and Related Practices of Text Production in the Light of Ahmed Midhat Efendi's Works in the Late Ottoman Literary Tradition*. PhD thesis, Boğaziçi U, 2005.

Genette, Gerard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin, Cambridge UP, 1997.

Gülsoy, Murat. *Gölgeler ve Hayaller Şehrinde* [*In the City of Shadows and Dreams*]. Can, 2014.

Gümüş, Semih. "Murat Gülsoy. *Gölgeler ve Hayaller Şehrinde* ve Ötesi" ["Murat Gülsoy: *In the City of Shadows and Dreams* and Beyond"]. *Notos Öykü*, no. 47, pp. 64-70.

Hagedorn, Hans Christian. *La traducción narrada: el recurso narrativo de la traducción ficticia*. Ediciones de la U de Castilla-La Mancha, 2006.

Hutcheon, Linda. *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*. Routledge, 1988.

Işıklar Koçak, Müge. "Pseudotranslations of Pseudo-Scientific Sex Manuals in Turkey." *Tradition, Tension and Translation in Turkey*, edited by Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar, Saliha Paker, and John Milton, John Benjamins, 2015, pp. 199-218.

Kaindl, Klaus. "Going Fictional! Translators and Interpreters in Literature and Film: An Introduction." *Transfiction: Research into the Realities of Translation Fiction*, edited by Klaus Kaindl and Karlheinz Spietzl, John Benjamins, pp. 1-26.

Kaindl, Klaus, and Karlheinz Spietzl, editors. *Transfiction: Research into the Realities of Translation Fiction*. John Benjamins, 2014.

Lefevere, André. "Pseudotranslations." *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English*, Volume 2, edited by O. Classe, Fitzroy Dearborn, 2000, pp. 1122–23.

Margaronis, Maria. "The Anxiety of Authenticity: Writing Historical Fiction at the End of the Twentieth Century," *History Workshop Journal*, no. 65, 2008, pp. 138-60.

Mitchell, David. "Past, Imperfect." *The Daily Telegraph*, 8 May 2010, pp. 20-21.

O'Sullivan, Carol. "Pseudotranslation." *Handbook of Translation Studies*, Volume

2, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer. John Benjamins, 2011, pp. 123–25.

Oral, Sibel. "Kimi zaman yazılan herşeyin bir tür mektup olduğunu düşünürüm" ["Sometimes I Think That Everything Written Is a Kind of Letter"]. *Cumhuriyet Kitap*, 17 Apr. 2014, pp. 22-23.

Öztürk Kasar, Sündüz. "Les pseudotraductions de Nihal Yeğinobalı: auctorialité féminine et émancipation." *Femmes écrivaines à la croisée des langues 1700-2000*, edited by Valérie Cossy, Suzan van Dijk, and Henriette Partzsch, Métis P, 2009, pp. 187-97.

Pamuk, Orhan. *Beyaz Kale* [*The White Castle*]. Can, 1985.

Popovič, Anton. *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation*. U of Alberta P, 1976.

Rath, Brigitte. "Pseudotranslation." *American Comparative Literature Association State of the Discipline Report—Ideas of the Decade*. 2014.

Şahinler, Seray. "O Mektubun Romanı" ["The Novel of That Letter"]. *Akşam*, 16 Apr. 2014, p. 17.

Santoyo, Julio César. "Seudotraducciones: Pre-textos & pretextos de la falsificación" ["Pseudotranslations: Pre-Texts and Pretexts of Falsification"]. *Mundus vult decipi. Estudios interdisciplinares sobre falsificación textual y literaria* [*The World Wants to Be Deceived: Interdisciplinary Studies on Textual and Literary Falsification*], edited by Javier Martinez, Ediciones Clásicas, 2012, pp. 353-64.

---. "La traducción como técnica narrativa" ["Translation as a Narrative Technique"]. *Actas del IV Congreso de la Asociación Española de Estudios Anglo-Norteamericanos* (Salamanca, del 18 al 21 de Diciembre de 1980). Ediciones Universidad, pp. 37–53.

Stocker, Bryony D. "Bygonese—Is This Really the Authentic Language of Historical Fiction?" *New Writing*, vol. 9 no. 3, 2012, pp. 308-18.

Tahir Gürçağlar, Şehnaz. "Agency in Allographic Prefaces to Translated Books: An Initial Exploration of the Turkish Context." A*uthorial and Editorial Voices in Translation*, edited by Hanne Jansen and Anna Wegener, Éditions québécoises de l'oeuvre, 2013, pp. 89-108.

---. Interview with Murat Gülsoy. 27 May 2016.

---. "Scouting the Borders of Translation: Pseudotranslation, Concealed Translation, and Authorship in Twentieth Century Turkey." *Translation Studies*, vol. 3, no. 2, 2010, pp. 172-87.

Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. John Benjamins, 1995.

---. "Enhancing Cultural Changes by Means of Fictitious Translations." *Translation and Cultural Change: Studies in History, Norms and Image-Projection*, edited by

Eva Hung, John Benjamins, 2005, pp. 3-17.

---. *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, Tel Aviv U, 1980.

Yağmur, Yağmur. "Bu Bir Özgürleşme Mücadelesi" ["This is an Emancipation Struggle"]. *Birgün*, 15 May 2014, p. 15.